

REMARKS

By the foregoing amendment, Claims 54 and 66 have been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 54-67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) on the grounds of anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 6,159,165, Ferrera et al. The Office Action indicated that Applicant's submission filed May 9, 2003 had been entered. Accordingly, the present application claims priority from Serial No. 09/019,841, filed February 6, 1998, now Patent No. 6,159,165, and the citation of Ferrera et al. is therefore improper. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 54-67 on the grounds of anticipation by Ferrera et al. should be withdrawn.

Claims 54-58, 61-64, 66 and 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) on the grounds of anticipation by Guglielmi et al. Claim 54 recites "said vasoocclusive coil being formed from a micro-cable including a plurality of strands." Claim 66 similarly recites "said vasoocclusive coil being formed from a micro-cable including a plurality of strands." At column 6, lines 51-58, Guglielmi et al. discloses that the platinum helix 20 is comprised of a platinum wire. It is respectfully submitted that Guglielmi et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest that the coil is formed from a micro-cable including a plurality of strands, as is claimed. Regarding Claims 56 and 58, it is respectfully submitted that Guglielmi et al. discloses a helical loop as a continuous coil, and not as a coil having a J shape. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 54-58, 61-64, 66 and 67 are

novel and inventive over Guglielmi et al., and that the rejection of Claims 54-58, 61-64, 66 and 67 on the grounds of anticipation by Guglielmi et al. should be withdrawn.

Claims 54-58 and 61-67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) on the grounds of anticipation by Snyder. At column 1, lines 62-63, Snyder discloses that the coil 11 is made from a metallic wire. Claim 54 recites "said vasoocclusive coil being formed from a micro-cable including a plurality of strands." Claim 66 similarly recites "said vasoocclusive coil being formed from a micro-cable including a plurality of strands." It is respectfully submitted that Snyder does not teach, disclose or suggest that the coil is formed from a micro-cable including a plurality of strands, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 54-58 and 61-67 are novel and inventive over Snyder, and that the rejection of Claims 54-58 and 61-67 on the grounds of anticipation by Snyder should be withdrawn.

Claims 59 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Snyder. Claims 59 and 60 depend from Claim 1, which recites "said vasoocclusive coil being formed from a micro-cable including a plurality of strands," and as noted above, Snyder does not teach, disclose or suggest that the coil is formed from a micro-cable including a plurality of strands, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 59 and 60 are novel and inventive over Snyder, and that the rejection of Claims 59 and 60 on the grounds of obviousness from Snyder should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By: 

James W. Paul
Reg. No. 29,967

JWP/rvw
Encls.: Return Postcard

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201
30167.1